UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/708,276	02/20/2004	Po-Wei Liu	REAP0050USA	2275

27765   7590   04/18/2007

NORTH AMERICA INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY CORPORATION
P.O. BOX 506
MERRIFIELD, VA 22116

EXAMINER
ABRAHAM, ESAW T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2112	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	04/18/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Notice of this Office communication was sent electronically on the above-indicated "Notification Date" and has a shortened statutory period for reply of 3 MONTHS from 04/18/2007.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

winstonhsu.uspto@gmail.com
Patent.admin.uspto.Rcv@naipo.com
mis.ap.uspto@naipo.com.tw

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _07 March 2007_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-15_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-15_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _20 February 2004_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

Response to the applicant's amendments

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 03/07/07 has been entered.

Status of Claims

1.   Claims 1-15 remain pending.

Claim objections

2.   Claims 1 and 11 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claims 1 and 11 recites, "A method for determining the integrity of a memory" in the preamble. CFR § 1.75 states that the specification must conclude with a claim particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention or discovery. A method does not indicate what a subject matter the claims are directed to (for example; the Applicant's invention is directed to testing a defected memory, see Applicant's disclosure, paragraphs 0007, 0008 and 0009).

The suggests is--- A method for determining the integrity of a <u>defected</u> memory ---

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

3.   Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 8 which have the phases "can be determined" is not specific and vague (for example, in the claim, the memory can be determined to have integrity. Which the memory <u>can be or cannot be</u> determined to have integrity). The rejection below will treat the phases "can be" as ---is---.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere* CO., 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1.   Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2.   Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3.   Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4.   Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

4.   Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brauch et al. (U.S. PN: 6,550,023) in view of Brennan, Ciaran J. (USPUBN: 2005/0134360).

As per claims 1 and 11:

Brauch et al. substantially teach or disclose a semiconductor memory testing,

and more particularly to a method and apparatus for testing on-chip RAM and

automatically generating a bitmap indicating cell failures (see col. 1, lines 6-9). Brauch

et al. teach a method and apparatus that makes it possible to detect and locate failing

cells in an integrated circuit memory and further data coming out of the on-chip

memory is compared to its expected value while it is still on-chip and in the event of a

comparison mismatch (or failure), the results of the comparison and its corresponding

address in memory area stored in registers that may be scanned by external hardware

and recorded in a bitmap or stored in another on-chip location for later retrieval.

Furthermore, Brauch et al. teach that data coming out of on-chip memory is compared

to one of two programmable values stored respectively in a pair of respective expected

data registers. The result of the compare is placed in a compare results register. Each

comparator outputs a 0 if its inputs are the same and a 1 if its inputs are different. If all

of the bits in the compare results register are 0, then the data read from memory is the

same as the data in the selected expected data register. Conversely, a 1 in the

compare results register indicates that memory data does not agree with the selected

expected data register. The location of the 1 in the compare results register

corresponds to the location of the incorrect memory bit. The outputs of each of the

comparators are logically OR'ed together to generate a fault indicator that indicates

whether a mismatch occurred in the currently output addressed word in memory. The

fault indicator may be used to halt the memory test long enough to scan the contents of

the compare results register and obtain the address in memory that resulted in the fault

indication (see col. 2, lines 26-64). Although, Brauch teaches testing memory cell defects and comparing values and generating a fault, Brauch et al. **do not explicitly** teach testing the memory under a plurality of operating environments, **However,** Brennan in an analogous art teaches a BIST or Built-in self-testing run each set first timing stress on a selected memory cells in a plurality of BISTsequences and run each first set timing stress using <u>different test patterns and/or different conditions that may be selected from a plurality of test sequences</u>. Examples of such plurality of different sequences may be a blanket read pattern, a checker board pattern, a high temperature-low voltage pattern, a low temperature-high voltage pattern and different environmental conditions (see page 3, paragraph 0037). **Therefore,** it would have been obvious to a person having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a testing a memory under plurality of environmental conditions as taught by Brennan for testing defected memory. **This modification** would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so because testing a defected memory under plurality operating environments improves the efficiency of the test process and accurately analyzes test data and stabilizes the production lines.

As per claims 2 and 3:

Brauch et al. teach an integrated circuit (IC) 2 that contains that includes a memory (4), built-in self-test (BIST) (6) and communication port (8). Further, the BIST functional block (6) is hardware, firmware, or a combination of both, that controls the

execution of on-chip memory tests that are designed to detect and locate defects in memory (4) (see col. 3, lines 12-48).

As per claims 4 and 5:

Brennan teaches a BIST or Built-in self-testing run each set first timing stress on a selected memory cells in a plurality of BIST sequences and run each first set timing stress using <u>different test patterns and/or different conditions that may be selected from a plurality of test sequences</u>. Examples of such plurality of different sequences may be a blanket read pattern, a checker board pattern, a high temperature-low voltage pattern, a low temperature-high voltage pattern and different environmental conditions (see page 3, paragraph 0037).

As per claims 6-10:

Brauch et al. teach BIST functional block (6) is hardware, firmware, or a combination of both, that controls the execution of on-chip memory tests that are designed to detect and locate defects in memory (4). A fault locator (20) residing within IC 2 performs the comparison between the contents that are read (via data output lines DATA_OUT) and the corresponding expected value. A mismatch between the contents of the addressed location and the expected value indicates a memory defect that corrupts the cell(s) that map to the mismatching bit(s) of the addressed word. Communication port (8)is used to send mismatch address and comparison result pairs off-chip for storage as comparison mismatches are detected. Alternatively, the comparison mismatch information is stored in a bitmap storage (18) located on-chip for later retrieval by external hardware. The accumulated mismatch pairs at the end of

the test comprise a complete bitmap of the precise location of failed cells in memory (4)

that were detected by the particular memory test executed by BIST functional block (6)

(see col. 3, lines 23-46).

As per claims 12 and 13:

Brauch et al. teach a block of an integrated circuit (IC) 2 that contains that

includes a memory (4), built-in self-test (BIST) (6) and communication port (8). Further,

the BIST functional block (6) is hardware, firmware, or a combination of both, that

controls the execution of on-chip memory tests that are designed to detect and locate

defects in memory (4) (see col. 3, lines 12-48).

As per claims 14 and 15:

Brennan teaches a BIST or Built-in self-testing run each set first timing stress on

a selected memory cells in a plurality of BISTsequences and run each first set timing

stress using <u>different test patterns and/or different conditions that may be selected from</u>

<u>a plurality of test sequences</u>. Examples of such plurality of different sequences may be

a blanket read pattern, a checker board pattern, a high temperature-low voltage pattern,

a low temperature-high voltage pattern and different environmental conditions (see

page 3, paragraph 0037).

Conclusion

5.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the

examiner should be directed to Esaw Abraham whose telephone number is (571) 272-

3812. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are successful, the examiner's supervisor, Jacques Louis-Jacques can be reached on (571) 272-6962. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (571) 273-8300 for regular communications and (571) 273-8300 for after final communications.

Information regarding the status of an Application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or PUBLIC PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private Pair only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Esaw Abraham

Art unit: 2112

GUY LAMARRE
PRIMARY EXAMINER